DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 426 772 PS 027 228

AUTHOR	Porter, Toni
TITLE	Supporting Welfare Recipients as Child Care Providers. Proceedings from a Conference (New York, New York, June 27-28, 1996).
INSTITUTION	Bank Street Coll. of Education, New York, NY. Center for Family Support.
PUB DATE	1996-06-00
NOTE	17p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Child Care Occupations; *Child Caregivers; *Day Care; Day Care Centers; Early Childhood Education; Economically Disadvantaged; Employment Opportunities; *Employment Programs; Program Design; Program Development; State Programs; *Welfare Recipients
IDENTIFIERS	Bank Street College of Education NY; Connecticut (New Haven); *Day Care Quality; Virginia; Welfare Reform; *Welfare to Work Programs; West Virginia

ABSTRACT

In response to strong political debate concerning the future of federal welfare policy and a push for welfare to work programs, the Bank Street College of Education's Center for Family Support held a conference to address the issue of welfare recipients as child care providers. The purpose of this meeting was threefold: (1) to stimulate thinking about the concept of using welfare recipients as child care providers; (2) to identify effective approaches that states could implement; and (3) to develop concepts for innovative strategies that states could develop. This report synthesizes findings of the conference. The report's preface documents the following panel discussions: (1) "Understanding the Context of Current Proposals: Past Lessons for Future Directions"; (2) "Preparing Low-Income Women for Careers in Early Care and Education"; (3) "Elements of Good Training"; and (4) "Improving the Quality of Care." The remainder of the report describes the outcomes of small group discussions. The first section, "Lessons Learned," examines characteristics of women on welfare and results of welfare to work programs. The second section, "Elements of Successful Programs," addresses issues of choice, accessibility, incentives, needs-based programming, cultural sensitivity, and support services. The third section, "Three Child Care Employment Programs or Welfare Recipients that Work," describe successful programs in West Virginia, Virginia, and New Haven, Connecticut. (Author/SD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 426 772

Supporting Welfare Recipients as Child Care Providers

Proceedings from a Conference June 27-28, 1996

Prepared by Toni Porter
Center for Family Support
Division of Continuing Education
Bank Street College of Education

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Toni Porter
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

PS 027228

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Acknowledgments

The idea for a conference about the issue of welfare recipients as child care providers began to take shape in the fall of 1995, when the Congress and the Administration were engaged in a heated debate about the future of federal welfare policy. In those early days, nine months before the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act would allow states to consider child care as an approved activity for welfare recipients, Caroline Zinsser of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and Janice Molnar of the Ford Foundation foresaw the need for a rational discussion about this complex issue. They recognized that information about how to develop policies and programs for welfare recipients as child care providers would be essential for the states. Their support made this conference possible.

Ann Collins, Andi Genser, Claudia Wayne, and Chantel Walker helped us create an agenda that encompassed the difficult questions that states would face — how to reduce welfare rolls, create jobs with viable incomes, expand the supply of child care, and maintain child care quality.

From Bank Street's Center for Family Support and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Kira Kingren and Julie Lesser managed the logistics that any meeting of people from different parts of the country involves. Their efforts, combined with those of the thoughtful and considerate staff at the Pocantico Conference Cent[illegible]ributed enormously to a day-and-a-half that was both stimulating and productive.

To all of the participants in the conference, we owe a great debt. This report of the proceedings is a testimony to their wisdom, their experience, and their deep-seated commitment to children and the people who care for them.

Preface

Late in 1995, the Mayor of New York proposed to remedy the shortage of staff for lunchroom duty in elementary schools by using welfare recipients as lunchroom aides. He argued that this strategy would address two needs: it would provide more adult supervision for children and it would provide parents with an additional opportunity for school involvement.

The announcement provoked an immediate response, primarily negative. Most of the opposition centered on the notion that welfare recipients were not prepared to work with young children and that their presence in school cafeterias might have a harmful effect. Other questions were raised about the idea of using welfare recipients to volunteer for responsibilities that were performed by paid employees. The idea was dropped.

The Mayor's apparently off the cuff notion contained elements of a larger debate that was raging in the public policy arena. It focused on reform of the welfare system. Spurred by the frustration of the failure of federal policies, the Administration and Congress were wrestling with the issue of how to develop new strategies to reduce welfare rolls. There was much discussion about time limits on public assistance, restriction on eligibility for aid, and the creation of block grants for states.

There was also much discussion about child care. Recognizing that welfare mothers who were working would need care for their young children, some elected officials proposed that welfare recipients could be recruited to provide child care to the children of other welfare recipients. Advocates of this strategy maintained that it would achieve two objectives of welfare reform; it would provide employment and it would expand the supply of child care.

The notion of using welfare recipients as child care providers generated considerable controversy in the child care field. Arguments against it were raised on several fronts. One was related to health and safety issues. Opponents of placing children in the homes of other welfare mothers expressed concerns about the possible dangers of these environments for children. They also pointed to the risks of exposing children to individuals who might have contagious diseases like tuberculosis, or other problems like drug or alcohol abuse.

Another argument was grounded in concerns about the impact of child care on young children, especially those from poor families. Relying on evidence about the role of child care in producing positive long-term outcomes for children, opponents expressed fears that welfare recipients might not provide children with the kind of care that would promote their healthy development. Women who took advantage of the option to provide child care might lack "intentionality," the kind of commitment to caring for children that research indicates is associated with good care. They would also lack the kind of professional training that is one of the correlates of high quality care.

A third argument was related to the notion of child care as a viable employment option. This argument drew on the well-documented evidence of child care as a low-paying, high turnover profession. Child care jobs, it was argued, might reduce dependence on welfare, but they would not produce income much above poverty.

As welfare reform moved closer to reality during the winter, it became increasingly clear that relying on welfare recipients to provide child care would be an attractive option for states faced with the need to expand the availability of care. It was also clear that turning to welfare recipients for child care might provide the opportunity for states to address three issues that extended beyond increasing the child care supply: preparing individuals, who have not had much formal education or employment experience, to work with young children; creating systems that would support child care as viable employment; and enhancing the quality of home-based child care. To take advantage of this opportunity, states would need information about strategies for meeting these needs.

In June, Bank Street College of Education's Center for Family Support convened a small group of practitioners, advocates, academics, and policymakers for a day-and-a-half

conference, "Supporting Welfare Recipients as Child Care Providers." The purpose of the meeting was threefold: first, to stimulate thinking about the concept of using welfare recipients as child care providers in the context of broader issues related to child care; second, to identify feasible and effective approaches that states could implement; and third, to develop concepts for innovative strategies that states could create.

The conference began with a panel discussion, Understanding the Context of Current Proposals: Past Lessons for Future Directions, about previous efforts to prepare welfare recipients for employment. In his review of the findings from research on a large number of welfare to work programs, David Butler, Vice President of MDRC, highlighted the issues that have both paralyzed and hindered effective welfare reform — the limited education and work experience of many welfare recipients, as well as structural features of the economy. Citing the mixed results of previous efforts, he warned against setting high expectations that would create a perception of failure if programs did not achieve their goals.

Augusta Souza Kappner, Bank Street College's president, focused on some of the problems welfare recipients may face as a child care providers. One of them may be the shift from a stable source of income, welfare, to unstable income that will vary depending on the number of children in care. In addition, providing child care may be difficult for welfare recipients who live in public housing or other rental housing where restrictions may limit the use of apartments for these purposes. Women who seek to become child care providers may also have to deal with domestic violence from partners who oppose their efforts to become economically independent.

Turning to the effects of welfare on children, Judith Smith cited the findings from a study that compared outcomes for children on welfare with poor children who had not received welfare, as well as those who had never been poor. The study indicated only marginal differences between children who were poor and those who had been on AFDC. The study also revealed that most women on AFDC need to supplement their welfare money and that about 46 per cent held jobs "off the books."

Against this background, Shannon Christian from the Office of the Secretary of Wisconsin's Department of Workforce Development, described Wisconsin's W-2 plan for welfare reform and its child care component. The Wisconsin plan included subsidy levels that varied according to the status of the caregiver.

The second panel, Preparing Low-Income Women for Careers in Early Care and Education, focused on the issue of child care as an employment option for welfare recipients. Claudia Wayne, Executive Director of the National Center for the Early Childhood Workforce, cautioned against coercing welfare recipients into child care. Pointing to the low wages that are a characteristic of the child care field, she advocated for an approach that would produce enough income to sustain families. Such a system would have to provide opportunities for welfare recipients to advance on a career ladder with appropriate compensation and benefits, supports such as job placement and social services, and specialized business training.

Dana Daugherty, from the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training in West Virginia, described West Virginia's effort to create such a system in its apprenticeship program which prepares individuals to work in day care centers. Sponsored by the Departments of Labor, Education, and Health and Human Services, the child care specialist program consists of two years of formal classwork in technical and vocational schools that participants can attend at no cost, and apprenticeships with incremental wage increases in Head Start and day care centers.

Michele Piel, of the Illinois Child Care Bureau, provided a perspective from the states. Emphasizing the scale of the situation — 50,000 children on welfare in Illinois, she raised questions about who will provide the care that these children will need and where they will do it. In this context, Michele pointed to the challenge states will face in allocating resources for expanding supply as well as for training providers. While the federal legislation might provide additional funding for child care, states would need clear directions on how to use this funding for training to improve the quality of car.e (Additional

funding was provided for child care in 1996).

The third panel, Elements of Good Training, addressed this issue. Drawing from her experience, Letisha Wadsworth pointed to some lessons from a program designed to prepare welfare recipients to work broadly in the child care field to provide assistance to legal exempt caregivers. Although the program had been approved as a welfare to work activity with classwork and fieldwork components, the welfare bureaucracy created difficulties for welfare recipients who sought to participate in it. In addition, many participants had low self-esteem and did not believe that they had the capacity to solve their own problems. Other lessons for working with welfare recipients emerged from the programs' outreach to informal caregivers. Letisha noted that many informal caregivers saw child care as a temporary job and did not intend to make it a career.

Based on her experience with the Family Education Training Program (FET) at Yale University, a nine-month program to prepare Head Start mothers for the Child Development Associate Credential (CDA) to work in center-based early childhood education, Muriel Hamilton-Lee also pointed to self-esteem as one of the issues that welfare recipients bring to training. To address it as well as social and family problems, FET facilitated weekly support groups for participants. In addition, the program used the CDA model of fieldwork and classwork, which enabled participants to enhance their self-esteem through work situations and to build on their existing knowledge of child development in the classroom.

Kathy Modigliani stressed the need to follow the principles of adult education in any program intended to prepare welfare recipients for work. Training must take into account the needs of adults. Chief among them are the relevance of the information, the opportunity for participants to connect their own experience with new information, and time to assess the new information by putting it into practice. Role models who can speak with authority about their work are also important as are opportunities for personal relationships.

The fourth panel, Improving the Quality of Care, focused on the different ways to improve the quality of care. Lucia Diaz underscored the value of community-based programming for high quality services. She talked about how volunteers from the community help to sustain the programs at the Mar Vista Family Center in Culver City, California. On a similar note, Mary Steinhardt stressed the idea of using other resources in the community to meet the various needs of families. Her program, CHIP of Virginia, which is primarily a health services program, uses resource and referral agencies, paraprofessionals, doctors, dentists and nurses to serve families. Mary felt that access to these different resources improved the quality of the care the CHIP program offers.

Acknowledging the limited budgets of states, Jean Mitchell suggested that states investigate the possibility of expanding good programs that are already up and running. She stressed that the notion of child care as work should be reinforced, so that it is valued by the provider, the community, and the government.

The conference concluded with small group discussions about a set of four distinct questions. How can existing resources be used to achieve multiple goals of reducing welfare, creating jobs, and expanding the child care supply? How can state policymakers expand the supply of child care and maintain quality? What strategies can states use to prepare individuals for the child care workforce? What information and research will be useful for state policymakers as they tackle these questions? Each group was asked to develop recommendations that would help states address these issues.

This report synthesizes the outcomes of those discussions as well as the panel presentations that preceded them. Although the conference was not intended to produce a consensus, there was strong agreement among the participants about approaches states could use to implement policies and programs if they choose to rely on welfare recipients as child care providers. These approaches have a single, overriding objective: to ensure that child care is good for the children and families who need it, and the caregivers who provide it.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Lessons Learned

States and localities that aim to create child care employment programs for welfare recipients can learn from a long history of efforts to prepare welfare recipients for employment as well as a large body of research on the child care field. This evidence can provide a context for developing new programs, because it provides insights into the nature of the welfare population, the results of previous employment and training efforts, and the special features of the child care field.

Characteristics of Women on Welfare

- A large proportion of welfare recipients have limited education. Approximately half have not completed high school or obtained a high school equivalency diploma. (The JOBS Evaluation of Adult Education for People on AFDC: A Synthesis of Research. US Department of Education and US Department of Health and Human Services. 1995. Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation.)
- A large proportion of welfare recipients have a limited work history. Between 25 and 50 per cent lack work experience. (Krauskopf, Jack & Berne, R. (Eds.). 1996. The Task Force for Sensible Welfare Reform. New York: Academic Divisions of the New School for Social Research.)
- A large proportion of women on welfare have been victims of domestic violence. Some data indicate that the percentage may be as high as 60 per cent. (Kinney, Catherine and Brown, Karen. (1996). Report from The Front Lines: The Impact of Violence on Poor Women. New York: NOW Legal Defense Fund.)

Results of Welfare to Work Programs

- Mandated work in exchange for benefits has yielded a modest — ten per cent — employment rate, slightly higher earnings, and reduced welfare costs. When individuals lost their jobs, however, they returned to welfare. (Friedlander, Daniel & Burtless, Gary. 1995. Five Years Later: The Long-term Effects of Welfare to Work Programs. Ithaca, NY: The Russell Sage Foundation.)
- Welfare to work does not necessarily address issues of poverty, because it functions as a dollar for dollar exchange, substituting earnings for welfare. (Levitan, Sar and Gallo, Frank. Jobs for JOBS: Toward a Work-based Welfare System. Center for Social Policy Studies, George Washington University, Paper 1993-1.)
- The most effective welfare to work produced earnings gains of $8.40 a week, or $2000 annually over a five-year period. (Friedlander & Burtless)

Issues Related to Child Care

- Child care is a difficult task. Professional success requires "intentionality"—a desire to work with children, an aptitude for caring for children, and a commitment to a career in the field.
- Family child care may provide an uncertain source of income as the number of children in care changes over time. This aspect of family child care may create difficulties for women who are accustomed to a regular stable source of income from welfare.
- Family child care providers, like other individuals who leave welfare, will need a living wage and health insurance.

Results of Selected Welfare to Work Programs

- Adult basic education programs for welfare recipients produced increased literacy levels and an increase in the number of people who attained their GED. (Levitan, S. & Gallo, F. (1993). *Jobs for JOBS: Toward a work-based welfare system.* Center for Social Policy studies, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.).
- Participation in welfare to work high school equivalency programs produced modest impacts on employment rates because a GED does not represent a viable credential in the job market. (Levitan & Gallo, 1993)
- Job Training Partnership Administration (JTPA) Programs have only modest success in preparing individuals for employment. In New York State, JTPA programs outside of New York City placed only a third of the participants in jobs. (McCall, H. Carl. (1996). New York State's Job Training and Job Creation Programs: Prospects for Welfare Reform).
- Evaluations of Welfare to Work programs found mixed results. Some produced modest gains in employment and earnings, but, on the whole, they failed to make any significant savings in any welfare dollars. (Levitan & Gallo, 1993).

- Family child care providers, like other individuals who leave welfare, will need child care for their own children. Caring for their own children will reduce their potential income because those spaces will not be available for other people's children.
- Welfare recipients often live in housing that does not comply with health and safety standards.
- Welfare recipients who live in public housing may not be permitted to establish family child care homes under the terms of their leases.
- Family child care requires both caregiving and business skills. Welfare recipients need both to enter this profession.
- Welfare recipients who choose to enter the child care field will need training and support as well as supervised practice.

Where Are the Children?*

- 22% with a parent
- 25% with a relative
- 5% with a sitter
- 14% in a family day care home
- 30% in a center

* Primary Care for the Youngest Preschool Child, Employed Mothers, 1993.

Source: The Center for the Future of Children, The David and Lucile Packard Foundation. 1996. *Financing Child Care.* Vol. 6, No. 2. Los Altos, CA: Author.

Elements of Successful Programs

Facts about Child Care Providers' Wages

Education

- In 1993, approximately 28 per cent of day care center teachers had college degrees. Another 46 per cent had some college coursework. The remaining 26 per cent had a high school diploma or had completed some high school.
- Approximately 36 per cent of family child care providers had completed college.
- Approximately 36 per cent had completed a high school degree or some high school.

Turnover

- In 1993, the annual staff turnover rate in day care centers was 37 per cent, four times the annual turnover rate in all U.S. corporations.

Wages

- In 1993, average wages for day care center teachers were $7.22 an hour, approximately $12,390 annually. Assistant teachers earned an average of $5.70 an hour, or about $9,781 annually.
- In 1990, regulated family day care providers earned an average of $4.00 an hour, or $10,944 annually. Legal providers who were exempt from regulation earned an average of $1.25 an hour, $4,275 annually.

Source: The Center for the Future of Children, The David and Lucile Packard Foundation. 1996. *Financing Child Care.* Vol. 6, No. 2. Los Altos, CA: Author.

To prepare welfare recipients as child care providers, states and localities will need to develop programs that can be implemented rapidly and that will also fit the parameters of welfare reform. Drawing from their broad range of experience, conference participants identified a set of elements that are crucial for effective child care preparation programs for welfare recipients. Together these programs elements will lead to effective program outcomes.

Choice

- Participation should be based on the choice of child care as employment.
- Participants should demonstrate an aptitude for child care.
- Programs should provide participants with information about the variety of child care employment options.

Accessibility

- Programs should use creative strategies to reach out to welfare recipients to encourage participation.
- Programs should make program entry and registration simple.

Incentives

- Programs should offer credentials that translate into increased compensation.
- Training should be linked to additional opportunities for academic or professional advancement.
- Training should support career mobility.

Needs-based programming

- Programs should be prepared to respond to the real life issues of participants.
- Programs should provide a choice of opportunities to enable individuals to enter at the level that meets their needs and to proceed at their own pace.

Integration of On the Job Training with Classroom Training

- On the job training or supervised fieldwork should be combined with classroom training.
- On the job training should put classroom training into practice.

Multi-level Curricula

- Curricula should include content about child development and parenting education as well as early childhood education.
- Curricula should also include basic problem-solving skills, an emphasis on cognitive development, and job readiness skills.
- Curricula should be sequential rather than one-shot and should provide repeated opportunities to discuss the material, and apply it to real life.

Conformance with Adult Learning Principles

- Preparation should be interactive and experiential.
- Programs should draw on the collective experience of the participants.
- Programs should provide role models with whom participants can identify.

Supportive Relationships

- Programs should encourage personal relationships between teacher-advisors and trainees.
- Teacher-advisers and mentors should support trainees during the full course of the program.

Cultural Sensitivity

- All aspects of the program—staffing, outreach, registration, classroom/on the job training, and support services—should be sensitive to cultural needs.

Support Services

- Support services for participants should include affordable, high quality child care and health care.
- Programs should also offer referrals to other services that participants may need.

What is the Quality of Child Care?

In day care centers:

- 14 per cent provide high quality care
- 74 per cent provide mediocre care
- 12 per cent provide poor care

In centers for infants and toddlers:

- 8 per cent provide high quality care
- 92 per cent provide mediocre care

In regulated family day care:

- 9 per cent provide good care
- 56 per cent provide adequate care
- 35 per cent provide inadequate care

Source: The Center for the Future of Children, The David and Lucile Packard Foundation. 1996. *Financing Child Care.* Vol. 6, No. 2. Los Altos, CA: Author.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

What Research Tells Us

About Brain Development:

- The brain develops very quickly and very extensively in the first twelve months of life.
- Environment has a significant effect on the development of the brain.
- Good environments — those that offer good nutrition as well as stimulation — for infants and very young children contribute to cumulative results in brain function.
- Two or more risk factors combined can contribute to later social and emotional problems.

Source: Carnegie Corporation of New York. 1994. *Starting Points: Meeting the Needs of Our Youngest Children.* New York: Author.

About Factors that Contribute to Good Outcomes for Children:

- Three general factors — temperament, dependable caregivers, and community support — can contribute to good outcomes for children.
- Loving, caring relationships that produce secure attachments between infants and their parents are a crucial factor in healthy development.
- Touching, holding, rocking, talking and reading to infants and toddlers fosters cognitive growth.

Three Child Care Employment Programs for Welfare Recipients that Work

At a Glance

The conference highlighted three programs that had high success rates in preparing welfare recipients for child care employment. The programs serve as useful examples for states and localities that aim to initiate efforts with similar objectives. Each of the programs can be completed within two years or less. Each has effective track records in terms of retention and completion. Each has job placement rates.

US Department of Labor, Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, West Virginia Child Development Specialist Apprenticeship Program

Features

- Occupationally specific
- Structured, formalized training system
- Employer-driven
- Required employer registration with the US Department of Labor Bureau of Apprenticeship
- Employer commitment to incremental wage increases
- Credit towards an Associate's or Bachelor's degree

Structure

- 4000 hours on the job training
- 200 hours classroom instruction

Program Content

- Child development
- Observation
- Curriculum
- Health and safety
- Effective communications
- Diversity
- Ethics
- Administration
- Resources
- Role of a Professional

Results

- 500 participants since inception
- 400 completed

Family Education and Training, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut

Features
- Preparation for the Child Development Associate Credential
- Formal academic credit towards an Associate's Degree
- Designed for Head Start parents

Structure
- Nine months (32 weeks)
- 480 hours of field work in early childhood classrooms
- 120 hours classroom instruction
- Bi-monthly peer support groups
- Individual counseling

Program Content
- Child growth and development
- Observation and assessment
- Curriculum
- Parental involvement
- Program management
- Professionalism
- Parent education
- Job readiness

Results (1995-1996)
- 29 of 30 participants received the Child Development Associate Credential
- 29 participants placed in jobs
- 25 participants employed in child care

Comprehensive Health Investment Program (CHIP) of Virginia Certificate in Child and Family Support Services

Features
- Certificate program for entry-level employment such as aides and home visitors in child care and family support services
- Academic credits towards an Associate's degree

Structure
- Nine months
- 3 credits in coordinated internship in human resources or child care
- 12 credits of classroom instruction

Program Content
- Human relations
- Child health and nutrition
- Child psychology
- Community resources and services

Results (1995)
- 35 enrolled since inception
- 4 completed

- As their children's first teachers, parents have a profound influence on their children's capacity to behave in socially responsible ways.

Source: Carnegie Corporation of New York. 1994. *Starting Points: Meeting the needs of our youngest children.* New York: Author.

About Long-Term Outcomes of Good Early Childhood Programs:

- High quality early childhood programs that offer family support services can prevent later delinquency and anti-social behavior.
- High quality pre-school programs can contribute to later adult success in terms of economic prospects and social adjustment.
- An investment of one dollar in high quality early childhood programs returns seven dollars saved in welfare and unemployment benefits.
- Early intervention programs that focus on parents as well as children can contribute to delays in or reduced rates of teen pregnancies.

Sources: Carnegie Corporation of New York. *Years of Promise: A comprehensive learning strategy for America's children.* 1996. New York, NY: Author.

The Center for the Future of Children, The David and Lucile Packard Foundation. (1995). *Long-term outcomes of early childhood programs.* Vol. 5, No 3. Los Altos, CA: Author.

Questions for Research

Programs that aim to prepare welfare recipients as child care providers will generate a research agenda that should be addressed during the next two years. The agenda should focus on the impact on children, the child care system, and child care quality. Conference participants agreed that answers to these questions will be crucial for mid-course corrections in current policies as well as future efforts to achieve these objectives.

Economic Issues

- What changes are necessary to make child care viable as employment for welfare recipients?
- How will changes in state reimbursement rates affect income for child care providers, centers and others?
- What effect will changes in supply have on recoverable tax income for providers?

Systemic Issues

- What effect will changes in eligibility for work programs have on the existing child care system?
- How will changes in eligibility for welfare assistance and child care subsidies, reimbursement for child care programs, and child care supply affect the publicly funded child care sector?
- What effect will supply-building strategies have on the child care infrastructure?

Quality Issues

- What are cost-effective models that can contribute to improving quality in a variety of child care settings?
- What effects will parental employment, especially among low-income women, have on child outcomes?

Reconciling Multiple Goals

Conference participants agreed that programs to help welfare recipients become child care providers have multiple goals. They aim to:

- Expand employment opportunities for welfare recipients.
- Increase the supply of child care.
- Improve child care quality.

Reconciling these goals with limited funding will represent a challenge for state and local policymakers. Participants identified a range of reasonable and feasible strategies for achieving these objectives.

How can states and localities provide employment opportunities for welfare recipients who seek to become child care providers?

- Identify and reach out to welfare recipients who have an interest in caring for children.
- Create educational campaigns to inform legal exempt providers about the economic advantages of regulated family child care.
- Provide supports for legal exempt providers to link them to the formal child care system of center-based and family child care.

How can states and localities increase the supply of child care for welfare recipients?

- Work with schools to expand the supply of before- and after-school care.
- Expand the supply of child care linked to religious institutions, hospitals, and other institutions.
- Improve marketing to enable programs to operate at full capacity.
- Use national service programs to provide opportunities for child care.

How can states and localities improve child care quality?

- Provide incentives to encourage legal exempt providers who care for children in their homes to obtain a license or certificate or to register as regulated family child care providers.
- Offer parenting education programs that focus on supporting child development to legal exempt providers.
- Provide technical assistance for day care centers and family child care organizations.
- Increase parental awareness of the elements of good quality child care.

Recommendations
for State and Local Efforts to Prepare Welfare Recipients as Child Care Providers

Conference participants were mindful that policymakers who plan to create child care employment programs for welfare recipients will face several challenges. Among them may be: resistance to investments in education and training for welfare recipients; limited resources; objections based on past experiences; and pressure for immediate results. They proposed several strategies to address these concerns.

How can education and training for welfare recipients be framed to increase its acceptability?

Change the language. Use business and labor terminology. Talk about apprenticeships and internships instead of education and training, classroom activities instead of education, on-the-job training instead of fieldwork.

How can limited resources be used to create child care employment programs for welfare recipients?

Plan with all relevant stakeholders at the table. State departments of welfare, labor, education; two-and four-year colleges; local education agencies; technical colleges; and employers: all have resources that can contribute to creating effective child care employment programs. New funds could be reserved for planning, coordination and strengthening these resources.

How can the previous pitfalls be avoided?

Learn from experience. Incorporate the elements of effective programs cited earlier. Create a special corps of caseworkers who have special training and a reduced caseload.

How can these programs produce immediate results?

Redefine "immediate" and redefine "results." These programs can achieve results within two years if they conform to the recommendations for program design. Small-scale programs that offer individual attention to participants with a state commitment to enable participants to complete them contribute to effectiveness. Document the degree to which child care employment programs reduce dependence on welfare. Document the need for higher wages and better benefits in child care for eliminating dependence on welfare altogether.

List of Participants

Bruce Astrein
Hasbro Children's Foundation
32 West 23rd Street
New York, NY 10010

David Butler
MDRC
3 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10016

Terry Castro
DHS- Division of Family Development
CN 716, 3 Quakerbridge Plaza
Trenton, NJ 08625

Shannon Christian
Office of the Secretary
Dept. of Workforce Development
PO BOX 7946
Madison, WI 53707-7946

Ann Collins
Nat. Ctr. for Children in Poverty
154 Haven Avenue
New York, NY 10032

Dana Daugherty
Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training
US Dept. of Labor
550 Eagan Street, Room 303
Charleston, WV 25301

Lucia Diaz
Mar Vista Family Center
5070 South Slauson Avenue
Culver City, CA 90230

Andrea Genser
Wheelock College
Ctr. for Career Dev. in Early Childhood
200 The Riverway
Boston, MA 02215

Melinda Green
Child Care Connection
2425 Pennington Road
Trenton, NJ 08638

Muriel Hamilton-Lee
Family Education and Training Program
310 Prospect Street
New Haven, CT 06511

Susan Hirsch Simmons
The Miriam and Peter Haas Foundation
201 Filbert Street, 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94133

Augusta Souza Kappner
Bank Street College
610 West 112th Street
New York, NY 10025

Nora Lichtash
WCRP
333 West Girard Avenue
Philadelphia, PA 19123

Jean Mitchell
Friends of the Family
1001 Eastern Avenue, 2nd Floor
Baltimore, MD 21202-4364

Kathy Modigliani
Wheelock College
Family Child Care Project
200 The Riverway
Boston, MA 02215

Diana Perez
WHEDCO
35 Marcy Place
Community Room 2
Bronx, NY 10452

Michele Piel
Dept. of Public Aid
310 South Michigan Avenue
17th Floor
Chicago, IL 60604-4202

Toni Porter
Bank Street College
610 West 112th Street
New York, NY 10025

Angela Roffle
1633 Helen Street
St. Louis, MO 63106

Judith Smith
Center for Children and Families
Teachers College, Columbia Univ.
525 West 120th Street, Box 39
New York, NY 10027

Mary Steinhardt
CHIP of Virginia
145 W. Campbell Ave. Suite 403
Roanoke, VA 24011

Letisha Wadsworth
Child Development Support Corp.
1119 Bedford Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11216

Chantel Walker
The Miriam and Peter Haas Foundation
201 Filbert Street, 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94133

Claudia Wayne, Executive Director
N.C.E.C.W.
733 15th Street, N.W. Suite 1037
Washington, DC 20005-2112

Oralee Wilson
P.O. Box 190660
Roxbury, MA 02119

Dee Woolley
NY State Department of Social Services
40 North Pearl Street
Albany, NY 12243

Caroline Zinsser
Rockefeller Brothers Fund
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10104-0233

Created in 1992, Bank Street College of Education's Center for Family Support is a direct response to two trends: the growing national interest in family support and parent education; and the growing demand for Bank Street's skill and expertise.

The Center offers three primary services, which draw on the College's long-established strengths: staff development for agencies and individuals who work with young children and their families; technical assistance for agencies that seek to develop family support programs; and policy and evaluation research.

For more information, contact the Center at 212/875-4546.

Bank Street

The Bank Street
College of Education

610 West 112th St
New York NY
10025-1898

Center for Family Support
Division of Continuing Education

BEST COPY AVAILABLE